REMARKS

Claims 1-5 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 3 and 5 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. Therefore, claims 1-5 are now pending and submitted for reconsideration.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 3 and 5 have been amended as appropriate. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,508,486 ("Welch"). The rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn at least because Welch does not teach each and every limitation of the claimed invention. For example, Welch does not disclose, teach or suggest "wherein the spacer is configured to rotate within the hole of the fabric sheet," as recited by claim 1. Rather, Welch discloses a door mounted side restraint system with fasteners (90). The fasteners (90) are placed in holes (47), which can include collar or grommet areas. *See* Welch at col. 5, lines 5-9. The Office Action states that "a grommet is a spacer positioned in a hole of the fabric sheet." Office Action at p. 3. However, the grommet is just an integral, reinforced portion of the hole (47). This grommet does not rotate within the hole of the fabric sheet and, thus, the rejection should be withdrawn. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Welch in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,091,795 ("Budwig"). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Welch in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,450,529 ("Kalandek"). Claims 2, 3 and 5 depend from claim 1. The rejection of claims 2, 3 and 5 should be withdrawn because the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Welch, Budwig and Kalandek, taken together or separately, do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of the independent claim 1. None of the references teach, disclose or suggest "wherein the spacer is configured to rotate within the hole of the fabric sheet," as recited by claim 1. Welch merely discloses a hole (47) with a reinforced area that includes a grommet.

Budwig does not cure the deficiencies of Welch. Budwig also teaches a grommet. There is no disclosure in Budwig that the grommet rotates within a hole. Rather, Budwig states that an object of the invention is to provide "a grommet which may be depended upon to *remain in place* after installation." Budwig at col. 1, lines 19-20. Kalandek also fails to cure the deficiencies of Welch and Budwig. Kalandek merely discloses an inflatable side airbag curtain restraint system. The system includes tabs (39) with holes (40) for connecting the airbag (22) to the roof rail (38) of a vehicle. Kalandek does not disclose, teach or suggest a "spacer." Therefore, Welch, Budwig and Kalandek, separately or together, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 3 and 5 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,195,857 ("Hiramoto") and U.S. Patent No. 5,677,027 ("Masuda"). The rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn because the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Hiramoto and Masuda, taken together or separately, do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of the independent claim 1. Neither reference teaches, discloses or suggests "wherein the spacer is configured to rotate within the hole of the fabric sheet," as called for by claim 1. Hiramoto discloses a fastener that includes a female member (2) with a flange (7) and a cup portion (6) for attaching to a floor panel (1). The female member (2) can be *integrally* joined with the floor insulator (3) and, thus, does not rotate within a hole (3a) of a sheet (3). *See* Hiramoto at col. 4, lines 60-61. Masuda does not cure the deficiencies of Hiramoto. Masuda merely discloses a sound insulating structure formed on an automobile floor panel. *See* Masuda at col. 2, lines 33-40. Therefore, Hiramoto and Masuda, separately or together, fail to teach or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and are allowable therewith, for at least the reasons set forth above, without regard to the further patentable subject matter set forth in these dependent claims.

Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date January 19, 2005

By Allan J. Carter, Reg. #28163

For Howard N. Shipley
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 39,370

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5490
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399